

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT POLICY REVIEW TASK FORCE

MEETING TWO - NOTES & SUMMARY

10:00am-4:00pm, November 1, 2005
Augusta Elks Lodge, Augusta, Maine

Task Force Members Present: John Adelman, Jeff Austin, Paula Clark, Peggy Daigle, Mark Draper, Steve Dyer, Will Everitt, Gloria Fredrick, Dawn Gallagher, Chris Hall, Victor Horton, Jerry Hughes, Sue Inches, Joseph Kazar, Fergus Lea, William Lippincott, Greg Lounder, George MacDonald, Jeff McGown, Don Meagher, Troy Moon (for Mike Bobinsky), Sam Morris, Stefan Pakulski, Peter Prata, Kevin Roche, Laura Sanborn, Ron Smalley, Barry Tibbetts, Filomena Troiano, Paul Therrien, Sarah Wojcoski,

Members of the Public Present: Matt Arnett, Marnie Bottesch, David Bragdon, Jody Harris, Cathy Lee, David Littell, Mark St. Germain, Sam Zaitlin.

Facilitators: Jeff Edelstein, Ona Ferguson.

Others in Attendance: Aimee Dolloff, Jackie Farwell.

Welcome

Sue Inches of the State Planning Office welcomed participants and reminded the group that the purpose of the task force is to share a range of perspectives on important issues to inform SPO recommendations to the legislature. This is the second of three meetings from which SPO will compile notes and make recommendations to the Natural Resources committee. Participants are welcome to contact SPO at any time about the notes from these meetings and any additional comments. Please email Sam Morris (sam.morris@maine.gov).

Participants then introduced themselves, and the facilitator reviewed the process, which included small, diverse breakout groups in both the morning and the afternoon which would be charged with going in depth on the subject of disposal capacity.

Additions and Changes to the Notes from Meeting One

Participants were asked to offer any comments or additions on the Meeting One notes.

- Page 6: While incineration has decreased waste volume, it is important to note that there is more waste coming into Maine landfills now – this is not working.
- Page 12: It should read “recyclables are considered solid waste,” not “solid waste is considered a solid waste” – the point was about changing the definition of solid waste.

Additions and Changes to the Assessment Regarding Disposal Capacity

Participants were asked to give feedback on the portion of the assessment that addressed disposal capacity. They gave the following additions and changes:

- Add: concern of state vs municipal control: One participant expressed that regulation of environmental impact of solid waste facilities is disproportional to how those impacts are regulated

for other land uses. For example, solid waste facilities have a review of traffic impact in which the threshold is so low that DOT considers it below the radar screen for other uses. Regarding water quality, landfills are not allowed to show any statistical change in any water quality parameters above background, yet there is no other use that has to meet that high of a standard. One participant responded that the word “reasonable” regarding impact is unusual for landfills because they will be there forever, whereas the industry that put the landfill there will be gone. Some landfill impacts (water quality and the land itself) will always be there, so regulations addressing this must be reasonable. Another participant noted that some impacts may go away after a facility is closed (like traffic), while others may not. Regulations should look at each impact and only consider it uniquely for solid waste disposal facilities if the activity is distinct for that industry versus for other land uses. The group as a whole appeared to agree that the impact of solid waste facilities versus other land uses or facilities should be assessed on an “apples-to-apples” basis.

- Regulations for landfills are performance-based, which is appropriate.
- Regulation of solid waste facilities is one of the few things municipalities don’t have control over. Local towns are not allowed to regulate solid waste more stringently than at the level of state rules; this is different than most (but not all) other issues under home rule.
- Add under bullet 3 on Facility Siting: Siting of landfills should be based on a balance between siting landfills distant from immediate neighbors, but not unreasonably distant from where the waste is generated. Increasing fuel costs (i.e., trucking costs) may play a larger role in determining landfill location in the future. Some members expressed that locating a landfill near a community can make for transparent operations due to visibility and people being aware if there is a problem, while another member expressed that the downside is that community residents are “lab rats” for health, groundwater, and environmental impacts.

Discussion of the small group policy questions

A handout listed 7 policy questions to be addressed by the breakout groups. The large group discussed the wording of policy questions 6 and 7 which originally read: 6) Is there a compelling interest for the state to help keep the eight municipal landfills operating in the state open?; and 7) Is there a compelling interest for the state to help keep the publicly-owned waste-to-energy facilities open? A participant suggested they be reworded to be more neutral, perhaps to read “should the eight municipal landfills remain open?” Another participant suggested wording it: “on what basis should the state decide whether to keep municipal landfills open?” Sue Inches stated that there is a need for clearer criteria around this. A participant noted that the only way the state could exercise control regarding municipal landfills is if the landfill isn’t meeting the terms of its license. The state can’t arbitrarily close a landfill because it chooses to do so.

Another participant requested that the small groups address another question, numbered #8: “Should something be done about the fact that landfills are filling more quickly than anticipated?”

There was discussion about how to address capacity issues when the capacity landscape is continually changing. It was expressed that discussion of solid waste management capacity always includes some uncertainties and that at this stage the group should focus on the questions of how the state makes decisions regarding capacity, rather than attempting to fine-tune the question of how much capacity is remaining. It was suggested that the goals are for the legislators to understand the nuances and main themes of these discussions, not for the task force to come to conclusions itself. There was broad interest in the group to have more information about remaining capacity in the state and how those projections are arrived at. George MacDonald asked the group to consider if the current process for making capacity decisions is as it should be, and if the triggers are appropriate.

Breakout Groups

The task force members split into 3 groups with the membership of each group developed by the facilitators to represent a cross-section of interests. During the morning breakout groups, the participants discussed what is working and what isn't working in the different policy areas. After lunch, the participants each noted their preferences for subject area for the afternoon breakout sessions which were to look at impacts and solutions. This brought the following five issues to the forefront of the conversation:

1. Does Maine need additional capacity?
2. How do capacity decisions get made?
3. Public Benefit Determination – how does it play out over time?
4. Commercial Disposal Ban
5. Municipal Landfills, Public WTE Facilities

The summary table of topics and rankings is shown on the following page.

Information Needs

- Participants would like information on capacity projections. Where is the state getting its capacity numbers that it is reporting? What is being counted? Could a breakdown of capacity be done by subcategory of municipal solid waste, special waste, and CDD in Maine and in the New England region? SPO will provide what is currently has to participants at the next meeting and consider how its disposal capacity analysis could be refined and improved in the future.
- Could SPO please bring the new vertical expansion legislation to the next meeting?
- SPO should do an analysis to establish the capacity needed to meet state needs for the next ten years, including an analysis of the whole New England region.
- SPO should do an analysis of tipping fees in all of New England to see what the market incentives are for disposal

Public Comment

Members of the public who were present provided some degree of input to the breakout groups. During the afternoon full group discussion, members of the public were asked if they had any comments and none were offered. One person said that he had a comment on host communities and would hold that until the next task force meeting when that subject is addressed.

SELECTION OF AFTERNOON SUBJECTS (FROM MORNING THEMES)

Subject Description	Number of Sticky Dots Rec'd
Italicization and letters in brackets indicate that that subject was pulled out and tagged as a subject for further inquiry in the afternoon	
<i>Restriction on commercial solid waste disposal facilities: not much desire to lift the ban, but some issues to address how the ban is used [D]</i>	14
<i>Public Benefits Determination [C]</i>	14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How it plays out at a site over time 	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has it ever led to a denial of project approval? (How important is it?) 	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application to vertical expansion 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition, breadth, scope 	0
Increase Capacity in Landfills	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty of projecting capacity, rates, why rates are changing 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty projecting and evaluating range of economic and other impacts 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Do we need additional capacity? [A]</i> 	28
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How do capacity decisions get made by the state? [B]</i> 	16
Use of airspace – out of state waste and construction and demolition debris	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower tip fees in Maine attract OOS waste 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OOS waste lowers tip fees for Maine waste presently 	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OOS waste may increase tip fees for Maine waste later 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDD is a problem, and something must be done about it 	22
<i>Municipal landfills, public WTE facilities [E]</i>	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These provide functions that the commercial sector doesn't 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are concerns about municipal landfills expanding into broader (OOS) material 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not agreement on the role of the state 	1
Fill rates	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It isn't that the rates are a problem, but predicting them is one 	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to know the impact of high and low fill rates 	2

PUBLIC BENEFITS DETERMINATION – SUMMARY OF FULL DAY’S DISCUSSIONS (PAGE 1 OF 2)

Key points/What is Working:

- It is important to look at public need.
- It is an important tool for DEP.
- It is applied evenly.
- It examines Maine's public needs, not other states

Other points/questions:

- Does it take into consideration new technology over time?
- If there is a public need; does that justify the public expense? The impact on public finances is part of the PB determination

Public Benefits Determination (PBD) (Page 2 of 2)		
ISSUES	IMPACTS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<p>Structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor definition; not quantitative • It is too narrow in the scope of what is considered for public benefits and risks. • PBD should also take into consideration regional/local benefit/need as well as statewide; need to respect local concerns; need to site facilities closer to where the waste is generated • Doesn't consider hierarchy sufficiently. <p>Applicability/implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for PBD now just applies to disposal facilities • It isn't applied to vertical expansion • It may not be consistently included in the state's decision process • It creates frustration in some members of the public who perceive it as ineffective in addressing issues such as OOS waste. • <p>Monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No ability to revisit original decision on which PB was determined (i.e. no provision for inflation or growth; presumes flat generation) • Sometimes predicted benefits don't come as expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues of practicality and political feasibility • Applicants may not know what to propose • Legal issues 	<p>Structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make consistent and uniform in its application across facilities • Establish objective, quantifiable standards • Reserve a certain percentage of capacity for Maine-generated waste (if constitutional) • Ask if the facility serves a need identified in the state plan/horizon • Should include an economic determination • Define public benefit in the state rule • Develop a threshold standard after which PBDs have to be done • Aim to offset adverse impacts (roads, oversight, etc) statewide • Linkage between facility applicants and control over waste reduction <p>Applicability/implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any capacity expansion should be required to submit a PBD, whether vertical or horizontal • We may also want to determine PB for processing facilities, large transfer facilities, recycling possibly. Disposal is only one part of the solid waste picture. <p>Monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link the PBD to the permits or DEP licenses for accountability over time (to guarantee enforceability and follow through) • If predicted benefits don't come as expected there should be an adjudicated process to determine if those responsible were negligent or if circumstances beyond their control changed. <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at how other states approach disposal facility ownership issues • Revisiting the PBD at a later time is not an issue. • It should be taken more seriously • Increasing recycling helps

BAN ON COMMERCIAL LANDFILLS - SUMMARY OF FULL DAY'S DISCUSSIONS (PAGE 1 OF 2)

Key points:

- The ban has broad support, but there are questions about impacts that it may have had and will have in the future.
- It was suggested that if significant changes to the ban were to made, these should be done 5 – 10 years out because of the business decisions and investments that have been made based on the ban.
- It was suggested that even if the ban were lifted, the private sector not attempt to site a new facility because of political pressures and NIMBY
- Also questioned was whether the public sector has the resources/capability to site/build new facilities.
- The broader question was raised of how Maine will be able to site facilities in the future.

What is working:

- Helps limit OOS waste.
- Achieved original intent; restricted the development of commercial facilities; prevented proliferation of landfills.
- Maine has lots of capacity now.

Ban on Commercial Landfills (Page 2 of 2)

ISSUES	IMPACTS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• May have eliminated the ability of small commercial landfills from being developed (all run now by the larger operators), but this might have been the case anyway because of regs.• No new <u>public</u> facilities have been built in all this time either which raises the question: does the public sector have the resources/capacity to site/build new facilities?• Has led to the birth of the Hybrid (publicly-owned, privately-operated). This raises a host of administrative questions (i.e. who is responsible, who deals with DEP)• Hasn't enabled obtaining the 50% recycling goal.• Context for solid waste management is different today than in the 1980's when the ban was established.• Might commercial landfills bring in efficiencies, new waste management technology, and opportunities better than municipalities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Relaxing the ban could result in commercial landfill owners bringing in OOS waste.• The ban has limited disposal options or alternatives that commercial sector might have brought• Could lead to capacity shortage in future because the state has less resources to develop facilities than the private sector.• Lack of knowledge of whether the ban has resulted in increased disposal costs.• Public recycling provides revenues to municipalities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• After commitments to those who have made business decisions based on the current regulations, perhaps changes could be made. This could be considered in 5 years by the next Solid Waste Task Force• There should be a clear definition of the term "commercial"• Change could happen, but slowly – in say 50 years from now• Economic impacts of the ban should be revisited – would additional capacity lower prices? Open borders would need to be assessed regionally, as it is a very complex subject• Might a hybrid model be possible where the town acts like the state, providing technical assistance on what is feasible, identifying parameters, and incorporating acceptable approaches into policy?• Maybe opening competitive bidding for operators would be good• There should be clarity on the state's role as the owner.

OUT OF STATE WASTE - SUMMARY OF FULL DAY'S DISCUSSIONS

Out-of-State Waste		
ISSUES	IMPACTS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• By-pass and ash from OOS waste processed in Maine takes up capacity that could be used for Maine-generated waste. There is an imbalance of import and export of waste.• We are importing too much and so getting short on capacity.• Some OOS waste classified as hazardous in the state of origin is not classified as hazardous in Maine.• OOS wastes could help offset the costs of managing waste in Maine; could be part of the solution. But OOS waste also takes up needed capacity for Maine waste.	None discussed	None discussed

***MUNICIPAL LANDFILLS AND PUBLIC WASTE TO ENERGY FACILITIES - SUMMARY OF FULL DAY'S DISCUSSIONS
(PAGE 1 OF 2)***

What is working:

- It is capacity
- Municipal landfills increase competition.
- Some municipal landfills serve areas that would be under-served by the commercial sector.
- Different approaches serve different needs; "one size doesn't fit all".

Other:

- Assumptions in the SPO capacity analysis includes these facilities; what would be the impact of their closing?
- Are there things the state can do to extend the life of these facilities (recycling, waste reduction) (operational changes)?
- Should the state do more from a policy perspective to keep these facilities open (i.e. subsidize them?)
- From a capacity standpoint, does it make sense to continue what we're doing? Does current organization of solid waste management make sense from capacity standpoint?

Municipal Landfills and Public WTE Facilities (Page 2 of 2)		
ISSUES	IMPACTS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Towns are losing their ability to manage landfills (staff reductions, budget cuts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity for now seems fine. To consider this, we need to know capacity levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state should look to future capacity needs Maintain the rules that exist, because things are working now. Some public/private arrangements may be desirable. Plan for the future with adequate time to establish incentives rather than punishing those who are doing business as usual If municipal landfills start taking out of state waste and acting like commercial landfills, the state may have a role in preventing that. Commercial activity by municipal landfills could require a Public Benefits Determination (to see where and when commercial activity might make sense). There needs to be a fair playing field; state facility or state-subsidized facility vs a local facility Are there things the state can do to extend the life of these facilities (recycling, waste reduction) (operational changes)? Should the state take over municipal landfills? State-owned municipal landfills could make existing capacity available to other users. There could be mechanisms for towns to have opportunities and options for saving money in solid waste disposal (this is a huge idea and would happen only when whole state was a clean slate) – it would be great if towns that recycled a higher percentage of their waste were charged less per ton in disposal fees. This would be a market incentive instead of a market barrier. Good for the state to have a plan, and to ensure that environmental and other regulations are upheld. Otherwise, the state should leave landfills alone There is interest for the state in municipal landfills staying open, so the state should ensure continued operation of municipal landfills as long as they are serving municipal needs The state should ensure that WTE plants stay in operation because they create significant volume reduction, help keep our landfill capacity, because they never fill up, and because they contribute renewable power and jobs

CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION DEBRIS - SUMMARY OF FULL DAY'S DISCUSSIONS

Key points:

- We have 2 dozen small, unlined, municipal CDD sites (stump dumps); should we extend their life and/or continue their use? Should this be part of the CDD infrastructure in the future?
- Constitutional issue.
- Need to re-evaluate tipping fees and the spot market.

What is working:

- It brings in money to those who get paid for it.
- Local sites are cost effective; presents an opportunity for managing CDD; as long as it does not impact water quality.
- OOS waste decreases tipping fees for in-state waste.
- Plants need waste to be energy efficient, which means they sometimes need to import CDD when they are otherwise under-capacity.

Construction and Demolition Debris		
ISSUES	IMPACTS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our tipping fees are too low, which is why we get other states' CDD. Towns want to know they're getting a fair disposal fee, regardless of their location or population.• OOS waste displaces room for in-state waste, which is a concern for the future.• State of MA reuses/recycles almost 90% of CDD (includes biomass), a lot through beneficial reuse		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tipping fees should be consistent statewide for all communities

NEW CAPACITY AT WEST OLD TOWN AND LEWISTON - SUMMARY OF FULL DAY'S DISCUSSIONS

Key Points:

- Adding new capacity to existing facilities will be difficult politically, public sentiment
- West Old Town Landfill affects capacity and time line a great deal

What is working:

- Reduces the need for new landfills.
- Existing sites are easier to develop than greenfield sites.
- Professional operations

New Capacity at West Old Town and Lewiston		
ISSUES	IMPACTS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• State statute of generator-owned facilities does not allow a mix of wastes• Lack of clarity in statute regarding what is a public versus private facility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Takes pressure off of recycling efforts• Doesn't expand competition.• Could result in importation of more OOS waste.• Could reduce waste going into publicly-invested and other existing facilities.• The impacts of new capacity positive or negative are unknown. These impacts could be far-reaching beyond just the impacts on nearby existing facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Need to look at most optimal mix of wastes in future (i.e. at West Old Town Landfill); especially as it relates to recovering methane gas• Enhance beneficial reuse in Maine• Any new capacity would have to be for Maine (in-state) benefit

***CAPACITY – DO WE NEED ADDITIONAL CAPACITY, HOW DO CAPACITY DECISIONS GET MADE BY THE STATE? -
SUMMARY OF FULL DAY'S DISCUSSIONS (PAGE 1 OF 2)***

Key Points:

- Capacity issues are different for landfills vs. incinerators; also they are different for different regions of the state depending on whether on the type of disposal options open to them (incineration vs. landfills).
- Licensed capacity is not available capacity unless it is built; the overall state capacity won't be changed by licensed capacity, only by built capacity
- Discussion of capacity is contingent on the resolution of court challenges against the West Old Town landfill.
- Task force policy discussions are best focused on how decisions relating to capacity are made rather than on determining current available capacity.

How Should Capacity Decisions Be Made? (Page 2 of 2)	
ISSUES/IMPACTS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing capacity goes against waste decrease efforts in the hierarchy, because cheaper disposal leads to decreases in recycling rates. Is the state artificially restricting capacity to increase costs to then in turn decrease waste generation? The decision has already been made for fewer larger sites rather than more smaller sites Concern that OOS waste displaces capacity for in-state waste High pricing of capacity serves as a recycling incentive Ensure space for future need (have it in reserve) – there should be a safety net with a long-term horizon Is the state committed to its responsibility? There are benefits to long-term future-oriented processes in terms of fairness to citizens and public expectations. If we add or remove capacity, we upset the stable framework that we know today. There is some security knowing there's a safety net of additional capacity should it be needed. Capacity issues include: economic impact, its effect on tipping fees, its effect on existing disposal facilities, the need for capacity, should it be licensed, and do we need it. Types of capacity: licensed, planned, necessary, discretionary, regional (within Maine), capacity needs, recycling (Jody) How do you estimate how much time is needed to develop capacity and what's the basis for that decision? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information should come from all facilities in their annual reports to DEP (or calls to each facility) Capacity numbers should be Maine-specific, or at least distinguish between in-state and OOS waste Should these be based on lowest cost for greatest number of people? Should be based on Maine-generated waste in terms of both volume and ton Should be based on <i>needed</i>, not <i>discretionary</i> capacity (this distinction should be made) Should consider the stability of existing facilities Should include an assessment of fill rates It needs to consider more than four years out It needs to identify available licensed capacity Consider “reduce, reuse, recycle” first to meet capacity needs Make recycling mandatory now Should there be an economic trigger for creating additional capacity? Maintain a diversity of options Should there be ways besides the Public Benefits Determination to limit capacity? Plan as if there could be a huge natural disaster (what would Maine do with the waste?) Do we need another Carpenter Ridge? Excess capacity on the ground isn't necessary, but it is important to have it in reserve. Need to plan for recycling as well as disposal capacity. Physical and fiscal need is the test for determining whether we need additional capacity Need longer lead time in developing future sites. What is the appropriate length of time? Maybe have a planning horizon of 100 years? Create a state inventory of suitable sites Could an entity other than the state be responsible for long-term planning and management of waste (municipal, state, or private)? Increased recycling and increased disposal bans We don't want an over-supply of capacity (because this will invite in OOS waste, lead to unnecessary financial and environmental costs, and lead to NIMBY) Address regional needs

RATE OF USE OF DISPOSAL CAPACITY - SUMMARY OF FULL DAY'S DISCUSSIONS

Key points:

- We count on sparse population and technology, and so don't worry much about capacity
- 5 years of existing landfill capacity left (not including West Old Town Landfill for which there is a pending legal challenge)
- A great deal of incinerator capacity remaining (in years). Incinerator operators told us last time that each facility has nearly and unlimited life; if investments and upgrades are made as needed
- There is at least a 10-year lead time for identifying, permitting, licensing, and building a new landfill.
- Would need 2 construction seasons to get Carpenter Ridge Operational
- Who has access to future landfill capacity?

What is working:

The cost of trucking decreases use of capacity, which is in alignment.

Rate of Use of Disposal Capacity	
ISSUES	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Facilities are using capacity faster than they projected in their license applications.• 4-year trigger may not be sufficient (SPO is required to notify the Legislature at the point when the state has 4 years of remaining landfill capacity. At this point the Legislature would consider whether to direct SPO to proceed with building Carpenter Ridge).• OOS waste is an unknown variable that makes it exceedingly difficult to plan for future needs (especially time estimates)• OOS waste leads to a decrease in the capacity for Maine waste• MSW increases 5-8% (tons) every two years. What are the reasons for the growth; why are we using more capacity than anticipated?• Individual financial needs of particular facilities leads them to seek OOS waste, which then decreases capacity. (note: this is an issue for just one landfill that is filling faster than anticipated)• The challenge is that Maine is caught between social and market-based systems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Need an analysis/study of this question.• Also forecast the impact of wood waste that will result from the GP contract (West Old Town Landfill)• Assess fees as way to slow disposal growth.• Have as a goal to decrease the panic around capacity by planning better• If one town recycles at a higher rate than another, should it get cheaper disposal rates (so towns generating a higher percentage of waste get charged more) – this would align incentives.• Reimburse households for high municipal recycling rates – maybe give a “recycling exemption” in property taxes by giving some financial reward to the town.

Facility siting - Solutions:

There should be a state plan on siting WTEs, and maybe incinerators should be sited near landfills in the future (it might be too late for this now)

Other Issues - Solutions:

Towns could create aggregated contracts with other towns and landfills to get better prices per ton. Right now there is no incentive to reduce volume of waste in disposal fees. There is, however, an incentive to reduce volume of waste because of decreased trucking costs and avoided disposal costs.